REMARKS

In response to the Examiner's objection to the drawings, enclosed herewith is a proposed correction to FIG. 1 to show the reference numeral "25" which was previously deleted from this figure. If the Examiner agrees to this correction and that it overcomes his objection, the formal drawings will be so modified.

With respect to FIG. 3, enclosed herewith is a proposed drawing correction enlarging the headings and the hope that this will satisfy the Examiner's request.

With respect to the illustration of the electrical magnet angle, this angle is actually described in the specification but enclosed herewith is a sketch that shows how the electrical magnet angle is determined consistent with the specification and the claim language, particularly as the claim is now amended. If the Examiner feels that this would be helpful, it will be added to the formal drawings.

Turning now to the rejection of Claim 2, the Examiner's position is well taken and Claim 1 has been amended so as to more clearly define the electrical magnet angle and Claims 2 and 5 have been cancelled because they were technically incorrect. In making this amendment, the Examiner's rejection under 35 U.S.C. 112 has also been considered and has been addressed with the foregoing claim amendment.

The Examiner has question the wording of "relative rotation". Actually, the relative rotation can be rotation of either the rotor, the stator or both, but at different velocities or in difference distances so that as a frame of reference one element is rotating relative to the other. It is not significant which is the rotating element.

With respect to Claim 4, this specifically states that the permanent magnets are the rotating element and the coil windings are held against rotation. If the Examiner feels some other claim terminology would be more acceptable, Applicants' would be happy to consider the Examiner's suggestion. In fact, the Examiner is most courteously solicited to call the undersigned if he feels that the present claim language is not clear and it is believed that such a telephone interview would result in a satisfactory agreement between the Examiner and Applicants.

Turning now to the art rejection, it is true that the reference that the Examiner has cited refers to an electrical angle but that electrical angle is not the same as that called out in Applicants' claim particularly as now carefully worded. Also, the reference does not address the problem, which is solved by Applicants' invention, and, therefore, it is most respectfully submitted that the art rejection should be withdrawn.

Favorable action is most courteously solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

Ernest A. Beutler
Registration No: 19901
500 Newport Center Drive
Suite 945
Newport Beach, Ca 92660
(949) 717-4821 Pacific Time

VERSION WITH MARKINGS SHOWING CHANGES MADE

1. (Twice Amended) A rotating machine having a plurality of permanent magnet having alternating pluralities in a circumferential direction, each of said magnets having the same circumferential extent and said magnets being positioned at [regular] equal circumferential intervals with non-magnetized areas therebetween, [and] a relatively rotatable associated element having a plurality of armatures around which coil windings are formed, the spacing of the poles of said permanent magnets and their number and the number and spacing of the coils being set so that if the degree of relative rotation during which each coil experiences a complete cycle of electrical current [during] is taken as 360° the circumferential extent of each of the magnet poles (the magnet electrical angle) lies in the range of 120° to 140° of such relative rotation [(the magnet electrical angle)].